Movement of Atemoya Fruit, *Annona squamosa x A. cherimola*, from Hawaii into other regions of the United States

Qualitative, Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment

June, 1996

Agency Contact:

Biological Assessment and Taxonomic Support Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Unit 133 Riverdale, MD 20737-1236

A. Introduction

This pest risk assessment was prepared by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to examine plant pest risks associated with the movement into other parts of the United States of **fresh atemoya fruits** (*Annona squamosa x A. cherimola*) **grown in Hawaii**. This is a qualitative pest risk assessment, that is, estimates of risk are expressed in qualitative terms such as high or low as opposed to numerical terms such as probabilities or frequencies.

International plant protection organizations (e.g., North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO), International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)) provide guidance for conducting pest risk analyses. The methods used to initiate, conduct, and report this plant pest risk assessment are consistent with guidelines provided by NAPPO, IPPC and FAO. The biological and phytosanitary terms (e.g., introduction, quarantine pest) used in this document conforms with the NAPPO Compendium of Phytosanitary Terms (NAPPO 1995) and the Definitions and Abbreviations (Introduction Section) in International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures, Section 1—Import Regulations: Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis (FAO 1995).

Pest risk assessment is one component of an overall pest risk analysis. The *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis* provided by FAO (1995) describe three stages in pest risk analysis. This document satisfies the requirements of FAO Stages 1 (initiation) and 2 (risk assessment).

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO, 1995) defines "pest risk assessment" as "Determination of whether a pest is a quarantine pest and evaluation of its introduction potential". "Quarantine pest" is defined as "A pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled" (FAO, 1995; NAPPO, 1995). Thus, pest risk assessments should consider both the likelihood and consequences of introduction of quarantine pests. Both issues are addressed in this qualitative pest risk assessment.

This document presents the findings of our qualitative plant pest risk assessment. The assessment methods or the criteria used to rate the various risk elements have not been described in detail. Details of the methodology and rating criteria can be found in the "template" document: *Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment: Guidelines for Qualitative Assessments*, *version 4.0* (USDA, 1995); to obtain a copy of the template, contact the individual named in the proposed regulations.

B. Risk Assessment

1. Initiating Event: Proposed Action

This pest risk assessment is commodity-based, and therefore "pathway-initiated"; this assessment was in response to a request for USDA authorization to allow movement of a particular commodity presenting a potential plant pest risk. In this case, the movement of **fresh atemoya fruits** (*Annona squamosa x A. cherimola*) **grown in Hawaii** into other parts of the U.S. is a potential pathway for introduction of plant pests. Regulatory authority for the movement of fruits and vegetables from Hawaii into other parts of the U.S. is found in 7 CFR §318.13.

Atemoya is a member of the genus *Annona*. There are more than 50 shrubs and trees in the genus, mostly in tropical America, some of which yield important edible fruits. They are of less importance within the region of the U.S. (Bailey, 1949). Several species are grown in Hawaii for their fresh fruits which are eaten raw (Neal, 1965). Species of *Annona* are grown in California, Florida and Texas.

2. Assessment of Weediness Potential of Atemoya, *Annona squamosa x A. cherimola*

Table 1 shows the results of the weediness screening for *Annona squamosa x A. cherimola*. These findings did not require a pest-initiated risk assessment.

Table 1: Process for Determining Weediness Potential of Commodity

Commodity: Annona squamosa x A. cherimola (Atemoya)

Phase 1: The hybrid is grown in Florida.

Phase 2: Is the species listed in:

NO*	Geographical Atla	s of World Weeds	(Holm 1979)
110	Ocograpinoui Illia	o of more meeds	(1101111, 17/7)

NO World's Worst Weeds (Holm, 1977)

NO Report of the Technical Committee to Evaluate Noxious Weeds; Exotic Weeds

for Federal Noxious Weed Act (Gunn & Ritchie, 1982)

NO Economically Important Foreign Weeds (Reed, 1977)

NO Weed Science Society of America list (WSSA, 1989)

NO Is there any literature reference indicating weediness (e.g., AGRICOLA, CAB,

Biological Abstracts, AGRIS; search on "species name" combined with

"weed").

Phase 3: Conclusion:

* A. squamosa, one of the parents of the hybrid, is listed in Geographical Atlas of World Weeds as a weed of unknown importance in Cambodia and Jamaica. Because this hybrid is grown in Florida, we proceeded with this pest risk assessment according to our guidelines (USDA, 1995)

3. Previous Risk Assessments, Current Status and Pest Interceptions3a. Decision history for *Annona* spp.

There are no previous risk assessments (decision sheets) on Annona spp. from Hawaii.

3b. Interceptions from Hawaii FY 1985-95 (PINET & 309 Database)

PEST	HOST (PART)	TOTAL	
BACTROCERA DORSALIS	FRUIT	 1	
BACTROCERA DORSALIS	FRUIT	3	
BACTROCERA DORSALIS	FRUIT	18	
BACTROCERA DORSALIS	FRUIT	14	
CERATITIS CAPITATA	FRUIT	1	
PSEUDOCOCCIDAE, SPECIES OF	FRUIT	1	
PSEUDOCOCCIDAE, SPECIES OF	FRUIT	1	
PSEUDOCOCCIDAE, SPECIES OF	FRUIT	1	
PSEUDOCOCCIDAE, SPECIES OF	FRUIT	1	
TEPHRITIDAE, SPECIES OF	FRUIT	1	

4. Pest List: Pests Associated with Atemoya in Hawaii

Table 2 shows the pest list for *Annona* spp. which was developed after a review of the information sources listed in USDA (1995). The pest list summarizes information on the distribution of each pest, pest-commodity association, and regulatory history.

Table 2: Pest List - <i>Annona</i> spp.					
Scientific Name, Classification	Distribution ¹	Comments ²	References		
Pathogens					
Armillaria mellea (Vahl:Fr.) P. Kumm. (Basidiomycetes: Agaricales)	HI,US	a,m,o	Raabe <i>et. al.</i> , 1981; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989; Wellman, 1977		
Botryodiplodia sp. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes	HI,US	a,k	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996		
Colletotrichum gloeosporioides (Penz.) Penz. & Sacc. in Penz. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	HI,US	a,c,o	Raabe <i>et. al.</i> , 1981; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989		
Colletotrichum sp. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	HI,US	a,f,k	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989		
Cylindrocladium scoparium Morg. (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	HI,US	a,m,o	Raabe <i>et. al.</i> , 1981; Sanewski, 1991		
Cylindrocladium sp. (Fungi Imperfecti: Hyphomycetes)	HI,US	a,k	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989		
Gloeosporium sp. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	HI,US	k	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989		
Lasiodiplodia theobromae (Pat.) Griffon & Maubl. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	HI,US	a,c,m,o,z _e	Raabe <i>et. al.</i> , 1981; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989; Sanewski, 1991		

Macrophoma sp. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	HI,US	k,z _e	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989
Phoma sp. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	HI,US	k,z _e	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989
Phomopsis sp. (Fungi Imperfecti: Coelomycetes)	HI,US	k	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989
Phytophthora capsici Lionian (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	HI,US	c,k	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989
Pseudomonas solanacearum (Smith) Smith	HI,US	a,o	Sanewski, 1991; Bradbury, 1986
Pythium splendens H. Braun (Oomycetes: Peronosporales)	HI,US	a,c,m,o	Raabe <i>et. al.</i> , 1981; Farr <i>et. al.</i> , 1989; Alfieri <i>et. al.</i> , 1994; Wellman, 1977
Rhizoctonia solani Kuhn (Fungi Imperfecti: Agonomycetes)	HI,US	a,c,m,o	Raabe <i>et. al.,</i> 1981; Farr <i>et. al.,</i> 1989; Wellman, 1977
Rhizopus stolonifer (Ehrenb.:Fr.) Vuill. (Zygomycetes: Mucorales)	HI,US	a,o	Sanewski, 1991; Raabe et. al., 1981; Farr et. al., 1989
Arthropods			
Abgrallaspis cyanophylli (Signoret) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Nakahara, 1982; Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996
Aleurodicus dispersus Russell (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae)	HI,FL	a,g,m	Anon.,1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Mound, 1978; CIE, 1986
Aleurothrixus floccosus (Maskell) (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae)	HI,CA,FL	a,c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Debach & Rose, 1976
Anacamptodes fragilaria (Grossbeck) (Lepidoptera: Geometridae)	HI,CA	c,o	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996; Zhang, 1994
Aphis gossypii Glover (Homoptera: Aphididae)	Worldwide	a,c,m,o,y	Blackman & Eastop, 1984; CIE, 1968
Aphis spiraecola Patch (Homoptera: Aphididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1969c
Aspidiotus destructor Signoret (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Nakahara, 1982
Aspidiotus nerii Bouche (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1970; Nakahara, 1982
Bactrocera dorsalis Hendel (Diptera: Tephritidae)	HI,US ₃	h,z _i	White, 1992
<i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i> Coquillet (Diptera: Tephritidae)	HI,US ₃	h,z _i	White, 1992
Bephratelloides cubensis (Ashmead) (Hymenoptera: Eurytomidae)	HI,FL	c,z_i	Anon, 1994; Nadel & Pena, 1991

	_		
Ceratitis capitata (Wiedemann) (Diptera: Tephritidae)	HI,US3	h,z _i	White, 1992
Ceroplastes cirripediformis Comstock (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	e,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Gimpel et. al., 1974
Ceroplastes rubens Maskell (Homoptera: Coccidae)	НІ	m,z _e	USDA, 1996
Chrysomphalus aonidum (L.) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1951; Nakahara, 1982
Chrysomphalus dictyospermi (Morgan) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	e,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1969; Nakahara, 1982
Coccus hesperidum L. (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1972
Coccus longulus (Douglas) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995
Coccus viridis (Green) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,FL	h	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1972a; Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996
Conchaspis angraeci Cockerell (Homoptera: Conchaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995
Dysmicoccus neobrevipes (Cockerell) (Homoptera: Pseudococcidae)	HI,FL	g,m,x,y,z _e	Anon. 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Harris & Maramorosch, 1980; Blackburn, 1988; USDA, 1996
Eucalymnatus tessellatus (Signoret) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1982a; Metcalf & Metcalf, 1993
Ferrisia virgata (Cockerell) (Homoptera: Pseudococcidae)	HI,US	c,m,o,y,z _e	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1966
Heliothrips haemorrhoidalis (Bouche) (Thysanoptera: Thripidae)	HI,US	e,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1961a
Hemiberlesia lataniae (Signoret) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	e,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1976; Nakahara, 1982
<i>Hemiberlesia rapax</i> (Comstock) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,o	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996
Howardia biclavis Comstock (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1957; Nakahara, 1982
Hypothenemus sp. prob. obscurus (Essig) (Coleoptera: Scolytidae)	HI,US	е	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996
<i>Icerya purchasi</i> Maskell (Homoptera: Margarodidae	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1971

Ischnaspis longirostris (Signoret) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Nakahara, 1982
<i>Lepidosaphes beckii</i> (Newman) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1982; Nakahara, 1982
Maconellicoccus hirsutus (Green) (Homoptera: Pseudococcidae)	НІ	m,x,z _e	USDA, 1996
Macrosiphum euphorbiae (Thomas) (Homoptera: Aphididae)	HI,US	e,m,o,y	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1984, Harris & Maramorosch, 1980
Mycetaspis personata (Comstock) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	e,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Nakahara, 1982
Nipaecoccus nipae (Maskell) (Homoptera: Pseudococcidae)	HI,CA,FL,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1966a
Parasaissetia nigra (Nietner) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o,Z _e	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; Sanewski, 1991
Pinnaspis aspidistrae (Signoret) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1977; Nakahara, 1982
Pinnaspis strachani (Cooley) (Homoptera: Diaspididae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995
Planococcus citri (Risso) (Homoptera: Pseudococcidae)	HI,US	c,0,y,z _e	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1969b; Metcalf & Metcalf 1993; Harris & Maramorosch, 1980; Sanewski, 1991; Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996
Pseudococcus elisae Borchsenius (Homoptera: Pseudococcidae)	HI,US	c,m	Williams & Willink, 1992; Anon., 1994
Pseudococcus longispinus (Targioni-Tozzetti) (Homoptera: Pseudococcidae)	HI,US	e,m,o,y	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1984a; Metcalf & Metcalf, 1993; Harris & Maramorosch, 1980
Pseudonirvana rufofascia (Kuoh and Kuoh) (Homoptera: Nirvanidae)	ні	е	Kunishi & Kitagawa, 1996
Pulvinaria psidii Maskell (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1994
Pulvinaria urbicola Cockerell (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995
Saissetia coffeae (Walker) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1973
Saissetia oleae (Olivier) (Homoptera: Coccidae)	HI,US	c,m,o	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1952

Selenothrips rubrocintus (Giard) (Thysanoptera: Thripidae)	HI,FL	c,m	Anon., 1994; Pena & Bennett, 1995; CIE, 1961b
Tetranychus urticae Koch (Acari: Tetranychidae)	HI,US	Z_{e}	Sanewski, 1991; Anon, 1994
Thrips hawaiiensis (Morgan) (Thysanoptera: Thripidae)	HI,US	a,c,e,o	Nakahara, 1994; CIE, 1983
Thrips tabaci Lindeman (Thysanoptera: Thripidae)	HI,US	a,c,e,o,y	Nakahara, 1994; CIE, 1969a; Harris Maramorosch, 1980
Toxoptera aurantii (Boyer de Fonscolombe) (Homoptera: Aphididae)	HI,US	a,c,o,y	Blackman & Eastop, 1994; Anon., 1994; CIE, 1961

Distribution legend: HI = Hawaii; US = Other parts of the United States; CA = California; FL = Florida; TX = Texas

- a = Pest mainly associated with a plant part other than the commodity.
- c = Listed in non-reportable dictionary as non-actionable.
- e = Although pest attacks commodity, it would not be expected to remain with the commodity during processing.
- f = Pest occurs in the U.S. and is not subject to official restrictions and regulations.
- Quarantine pest, pest has limited distribution in the U.S. and is under official control as follows; pest listed by name in USDA's pest dictionary, official quarantine action may be taken on this pest when intercepted on this commodity.
- h = Quarantine pest: pest has limited distribution in the U.S. and is under official control as follows: (1) pest listed by name in USDA's pest distionary, (2) pest is a program pest.
- k = Not specifically listed for host, but reported from other hosts in the same genus.
- m = The pest occurs within the PRA area and has been reported to attack the genus in other geographic regions; but has not been reported to attack the genus in the PRA area.
- Pest does not meet the geographic or regulatory definition of a quarantine pest.
- x = Multiple interception records exist.
- y = Pest is a vector of plant pathogens.
- z_e = External pest: is known to attack or infest fruits of *Annona* spp. and it would be reasonable to expect the pest may remain with the commodity during processing and shipping.
- z_i = Internal pest: is known to attack or infest fruits of *Annona* spp. and it would be reasonable to expect the pest may remain with the commodity during processing and shipping.

² Comments:

³ Bactrocera cucurbitae, B. dorsalis, and Ceratitis capitata have been detected on occassion in the Unites States. Whenever they are detected, a quarantine is established and an eradication program implemented. These fruit flies are considered to be quarantine pests in the United States.

5. List of Quarantine Pests

The list of quarantine pests for commercial shipments of atemoya fruits from Hawaii is provided in Table 3. Should any of these pests be intercepted on commercial (or any other) shipments of atemoya, quarantine action will be taken.

Table 3: Quarantine Pests: Atemoya fruits consumption

Arthropods Aleurodicus dispersus Russell

Bactrocera dorsalis Hendel Bactrocera cucurbitae Coquillet Ceratitis capitata (Wiedemann) Ceroplastes rubens Maskell

Coccus viridis (Green)

Dysmicoccus neobrevipes (Cockerell) Maconellicoccus hirsutus (Green)

6. Quarantine Pests Likely to Follow Pathway (*i.e.*, Quarantine Pests Selected for Further Analysis)

Only those quarantine pests that could reasonably be expected to follow the pathway, *i.e.*, be included in commercial shipments of atemoya fruits were analyzed in detail (see USDA, 1995 for selection criteria). Only quarantine pest listed in Table 4 were selected for further analysis and subjected to steps 7-9 below. Although *Ceroplastes rubens*, *Dysmicoccus neobrevipes* and *Maconellicoccus hirsutus* have not been associated with annona in Hawaii, they have been intercepted on fruits from other tropical areas so they were included for further evaluation.

Table 4: Quarantine Pest Selected for Further Analysis: Hawaiian Atemoya Fruits for consumption

Arthropods Bactrocera dorsalis

Bactrocera curcurbitae

Ceratitis capitata Ceroplastes rubens

Dysmicoccus neobrevipes Maconellicoccus hirsutus

Hawaiian Atemoya Fruits: Pest Risk Assessment — USDA-APHIS-PPQ — June 1996 —

7. Economic Importance: Consequences of Introduction

The consequences of introduction was considered for each quarantine pest selected for further analysis. For qualitative, pathway-initiated pest risk assessments, these risks are estimated by rating each pest with respect to five risk elements. A full description of these elements and rating criteria can be found in USDA (1995). Table 5 shows the risk ratings for these risk elements.

Table 5: Risk Rating: Consequences of Introduction						
Pest	Climate/ Host	Host Range	Dispersal	Economic	Environ- mental	Risk Rating
Bactrocera dorsalis	high	high	high	high	high	high
Bactrocera cucurbitae	high	high	high	high	high	high
Ceratitis capitata	high	high	high	high	high	high
Ceroplastes rubens	high	high	low	medium	medium	medium
Dysmicoccus neobrevipes	low	high	low	medium	medium	medium
Maconellicoccus hirsutus	medium	high	medium	high	high	high

8. Likelihood of Introduction

Each pest was rated with respect to introduction potential (*i.e.*, entry and establishment). Two separate components were considered. First, the amount of commodity likely to be moved was estimated. More movement leads to greater risk; the result is a risk rating (0, 1, or 2) that applies to the commodity and country in question and is the same for all quarantine pest considered. Second, five biological features *i.e.* risk elements, concerning the pest and its interactions with the commodity were considered. The resulting risk ratings were specific to each pest. Details of elements and rating criteria can be found in USDA (1995). The cumulative risk rating for introduction was considered to be an indicator of the likelihood that a particular pest would be introduced. Table 6 shows the ratings for these risk elements.

Table 6: Risk Rating: Likelihood of Introduction							
Pest	Quantity of commodity imported annually	Likelihood survive postharvest treatment	Likelihood survive shipment	Likelihood not detected at port of entry	Likelihood moved to suitable habitat	Likeli- hood find suit-able host	Risk rating
Bactrocera dorsalis	low	high	high	high	high	low	high
Bactrocera cucurbitae	low	high	high	high	high	low	high
Ceratitis capitata	low	high	high	high	high	low	high
Ceroplastes rubens	low	high	high	medium	low	high	medium
Dysmicoccus neobrevipes	low	high	high	medium	medium	medium	medium
Maconellicoccus hirsutus	low	high	high	medium	low	low	medium

9. Conclusion: Pest Risk Potential and Phytosanitary Measures

The measure of pest risk potential combines the risk ratings for consequences and likelihood of introduction as described in USDA (1995). Table 7 shows the estimated pest risk potential for the quarantine pests selected for further analysis for the movement of atemoya fruits from Hawaii.

Table 7: Pest Risk Potential, Quarantine Pests, <i>Annona squamosa x A. cherimola</i>				
Pest	Pest Pest risk potential			
Bactrocera dorsalis	high			
Bactrocera cucurbitae	high			
Ceratitis capitata	high			
Ceroplastes rubens	medium			
Dysmicoccus neobrevipes	medium			
Maconellicoccus hirsutus	high			

For those pests, except *M. hirsutus*, receiving a high PRP risk rating, we recommend specific phytosanitary measures be implemented, port-of-entry inspection is not considered sufficient to provide phytosanitary security. *M. hirsutus* has not been associated with *Annona* in Hawaii and therefore movement of fruit is unlikely to serve as a pathway for introduction. Although *M. hirsutus* is established in Hawaii it has had little or no impact, probably due to the introduction of a parasite about the same time. PPQ currently inspects other commodities which serve as hosts for this mealybug from the Caribbean area. If this mealybug is intercepted on *Annona* fruits, Operational Support staff may establish appropriate sanitary and phytosanitary measures they believe necessary to mitigate pest risk. The pest risk management phase of the PRA is not part of this document. Appropriate sanitary and phytosanitary measures to mitigate pest risk will be determined during the pest risk management phase.

PPQ has intercepted over 600 pests on fruits of *Annona* spp. from other areas of the world; however, virtually all external pests listed could be detected by inspection. Some of these same pests occur in Hawaii in addition to other quarantine pests and have been intercepted as hitchhikers with other commodities. Should any of these pests be intercepted on commercial (or any other) shipments of atemoya, quarantine action may be taken.

C. References

- Alfieri, S. A., Jr., K. R. Langdon, J. W. Kimbrough, N. E. El-Gholl, & C. Wehlburg. 1994. Diseases and Disorders of Plants in Florida. Division of Plant Industry, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Bulletin 11. 389 pp.
- Anonymous. 1994. Distribution and Host Records of Agricultural Pests and Other Organisms in Hawaii. 68 pp.
- Bailey, L. H. 1949. Manual of Cultivated Plants. Macmillan Publishing Company, N. Y. 1116 pp.
- Blackburn, V. L. 1988. Personal communication (August 3) to Dr. Avas B. Hamon, Division of Plant Industry, Gainsville, Fl.
- Blackman, R. L. & V. F. Eastop. 1984. Aphids on the World's Crops. An Identification Guide. 466 pp.
- Blackman, R. L. & V. F. Eastop. 1994. Aphids on the World's Tree, An Identification and Information Guide. 987 pp.
- Bradbury, J. F. 1986. Guide to Plant Pathogenic Bacteria. CAB International Mycological Institute, Surrey, England. 332 pp.
- CIE. 1951. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 4, *Chrysomphalus ficus (aonidum* auct.). Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1952. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 24, Saissetia oleae. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1957. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 80, *Howardia biclavis*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1961. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 135, *Toxoptera aurantii*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1961a. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 135, *Helothrips haemorrhoidalis*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1961b. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 136, *Selenothrips rubrocinctus*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1966. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 219, Ferrisia virgata. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1966a. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 220, *Nipaecoccus nipae*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1968. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 18, *Aphis gossypii*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1969. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 3, *Chrysomphalus dictyospermi*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1969a. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 20, *Thrips tabaci*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1969b. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 43, *Planococcus citri*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1969c. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 256, *Aphis spiraecola*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1970. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 268, *Aspidiotus nerii*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1971. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 51, *Icerya purchasi*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux. UK.
- CIE. 1972. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 92, *Coccus hesperidum*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.

- CIE. 1972a. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 305, *Coccus viridis*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1973. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 318, Saissetia coffeae. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1976. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 360, *Hemiberlesia lantaniae*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1977. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 369, *Pinnaspis aspidistrae*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1982. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 49, *Lepidosaphes beckii*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1982a. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 441, *Eucalymnatus tesselatus*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1983. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 431, *Thrips hawaiiensis*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1984. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 44, *Macrosiphum euphorbiae*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1984a. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 93, *Pseudococcus longispinus*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux, UK.
- CIE. 1986. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 476, *Aleurodicus dispersus*. CAB International Institute of Entomology, UK.
- CIE. 1994. Distribution Maps of Pests, Number 59, *Pulvinaria psidii*. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux International, UK.
- DeBach, P. & M. Rose. 1976. Biological control of wooly whitefly (*Aleurothrixus floccosus*, citrus). Calif. Agric. 30:407.
- FAO. 1995. International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures. Section 1 Import Regulations: Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis (Draft Standard). Secretariate of the International Plant Protection Convention of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome, Italy.
- Farr, D. F., G. F. Bills, G. P. Chamuris and A. Y. Rossman. 1989. Fungi on plants and plant products in the United States. American Phytopathological Society, St. Paul, Minnesota. 1252 pp.
- Gimple, W. F. Jr., D. R. Miller, & J. A. Davidson. 1974. A Systematic Revision of the Wax Scales, Genus Ceroplastes, in States (Homoptea; Coccoidea; Coccidae). Misc. Pub. 841. Agricultural Experiment Station, Univ. of MD, College Park, MD. 85 pp.
- Gunn, C.R. and C. Ritchie. 1982. 1982 Report of the Technical Committee to Evaluate Noxious Weeds; Exotic Weeds for Federal Noxious Weed Act. (unpublished).
- Harris, K. F. & K. Maramorosch. 1980. Vectors of Plant Pathogens. Academic Press, NY. 467 pp.
- Holm, L.G., D.L. Plucknett, J.V. Pancho and J.P. Herberger. 1977. The World's Worst Weeds. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu. 609 pp.
- Holm, L.G., J.V. Pancho and J.P. Herberger and D.L. Plucknett. 1979. A Geographical Atlas of World Weeds. John Wiley and Sons, New York. 391 pp.
- Kunishi, R. K. & A. Kitagawa. 1996. Personal correspondence (Letter) regarding pests in Hawaii. 13 pp.
- Metcalf, R. L. & R. A. Metcalf. 1993. Destructive and Useful Insects, Their Habits and Control. McGraw-Hill, Inc. NY.
- Mound, L. A. & S. H. Halsey 1978. Whitefly of the World. British Museum. 340 pp.
- Nadel, H. & J. E. Pena. 1991. Seasonal oviposition and emergence activity of Bephratelloides cubensis (Hymenoptera: Eurytomidae), a pest of Annona species in Florida. Environ. Entomol. 20:1053-1057.

- Nakahara, S. 1982. Checklist of the Armored Scales (Homoptera: Diaspididae) of the Conterminous United States. USDA. 110 pp.
- Nakahara, S. 1994. The Genus *Thrips* Linnaeus (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) of the New World. ARS, USDA, Washington, DC. 183 pp.
- NAPPO/FAO. 1995. NAPPO/FAO Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms. North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) and United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). NAPPO Secretariate, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Neal, M. C. 1965. In Gardens of Hawaii. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, HI. 924 pp.
- Pena, J. E. & F. D. Bennett. 1995. Arthropods Associated with *Annona* spp. in the Neotropics. Florida Entomologist 78:329-349.
- Raabe, R. D., I. L. Conners and A. P. Martinez. 1981. Checklist of plant diseases in
 Hawaii. Hawaii Institute of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, College of Tropical
 Agriculture and Human Resources, Information Text Series 022. University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
 313 pp.
- Reed, C.F. 1977. Economically Important Foreign Weeds. Agriculture Handbook No. 498, 746 pp.
 Sanewski, G.(ed.) 1991. Custard apples, cultivation and crop protection. Information Series Q190031, Queensland Department of Primary Industries, Brisbane, Australia.
 103 pp.
- USDA. 1995. Pathway-Initiated Pest Risk Assessment: Guidelines for Qualitative Assessments, Version 4.0, PPQ, APHIS. 15 pp.
- USDA. 1996. BATS 309 Pest Interception Database, APHIS, PPQ. Completed June 1996.
- Wellman, F. L. 1977. Dictionary of Tropical American Crops and Their Diseases. The Scarecrow Press, Inc. 495 pp.
- White, I. M. & M. M. Elson-Harris. 1992. Fruit Flies of Economic Significance: Their Identification and Bionomics. CAB International, UK. 601 pp.
- Williams, D. J. & M. C. Granara de Willink. 1992. Mealybugs of Central and South America. CAB International, UK. 635 pp.
- WSSA, 1989. Composite List of Weeds. Weed Science Society of America.
- Zhang, Bin-Chang. 1994. Index of Economic Important Lepidoptera (Electronic Version)

John Lightfield Biological Assessment and Taxonomic Support Plant Protection and Quarantine June 1996

Reviewed by:

- G. Cave, Entomologist
- R. Stewart, Entomologist
- E. Miller, Entomologist
- S. Redlin, Plant Pathologist
- L. Redmond, Plant Pathologist